

## **REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

Claim 20 has been amended to recite that the outer layer completely overlies the releaseable fasteners. The rejection of claim 20 is believed to have been expressly based on an interpretation of claim 20 in which fasteners, other than the releasable fasteners might be partially covered as in Bernard. Claim 20 was not intended to be read as broadly as interpreted in the rejection. Applicant submits that claim 20 would not have been susceptible of such an interpretation. However, in an effort to expedite consideration of this application, applicant is willing to amend claim 20 in the manner believed to have been implicit in the statement of reasons for rejecting claim 20 over Bernard. Partial coverage of the fasteners in Bernard would serve no purpose, and complete coverage as now claimed would not have been obvious.

Claim 20 has also been amended in line 1 in the manner suggested in the claim objections in the Final Rejection.

Claims 23 and 28 have been canceled to expedite consideration of this application.

New claim 34 includes additional subject matter corresponding to that presented in Claim 13 of the parent application as originally filed and appearing in Claim 3 of US Patent 6,926,705. The pocket of the embodiment of Figures 3-3F is formed in substantially the same way that the pocket is formed in the embodiment of Figures 1-1G, except that the pocket is not stitched directly to the anchor cloth. Paragraph 0056 of US Published Patent Application, corresponding to this application, states with reference to the embodiment of Figures 3-3F that "The absorbing pocketed-sling of Fig. 1 is detachable through the optional fastener material ...." Figures 3D and 3F show the same triangular portions that are removed as depicted in Figure 1D. It follows therefore that new claim 34 is supported by the text and the drawings of the application as originally filed.


The objection to the specification is understood to refer to the replacement of reference number 162 with reference number 163 in a consistent manner. The replacement paragraph is therefore believed to be correct this error. No other errors are apparent to the undersigned.

A replacement drawing sheet for Figure 9 is submitted. As understood, this is the only pending substantive drawing objection.

The Amendment After the Final Rejection of August 6, 2008 was not entered on the grounds that the amendment to Claim 20, raised new issues which would require further consideration and/or search. As understood, a Final Rejection on a First Office Action to this amendment, containing the same amended Claim 20, would not be appropriate according to MPEP Section 706.07(b). However, Applicant formally requests an in person interview with the Examiner in her office, at the Examiner's convenience prior to entry of a Final Rejection. At such interview the Inventor would be prepared to demonstrate to the Examiner the importance of the outer layer completely overlying the releasable fasteners on the anchor layer as now claimed. Should the examiner believe that consideration of this application would be expedited by such an interview prior to a next Non-Final Office Action, applicant would be prepared to arrange such interview at the Examiner's convenience.

This amendment is believed to place this application in condition for allowance. Entry of this Amendment is therefore believed to be appropriate. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is also believed to be appropriate and such action is courteously solicited.

Respectfully Submitted:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert W. Pitts".

Robert W. Pitts  
Registration No. 27372  
Attorney for Applicant  
Phone: 336-760-9565

## **Appendix**

One Replacement Drawing Sheet is submitted herewith.

Figure 9

